1 2	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP ALBERT J. BORO, JR. (CA Bar # 126657) albert.boro@pillsburylaw.com JOANNE H. KIM (CA Bar # 221525) joanne.kim@pillsburylaw.com 50 Fremont Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 983-1000		
3			
4			
5	Facsimile: (415) 983-1200		
6	Attorneys for Defendant SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION		
7	SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
11			
12	Dr. Steven Martel, on behalf of himself and)) No. C-06-7888 EDL	
13	all others similarly situated,)) <u>STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]</u>	
	Plaintiff,	ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO	
14	v.) RESPOND TO COMPLAINT)	
15	Sharp Corporation, et al.,)	
16	-)	
17	Defendants.))	
18			
19	STIPULATION FO	R EXTENSION OF TIME	
20	WHEREAS plaintiff filed a complaint in the above-captioned case on or about		
21	December 26, 2006;		
22	WHEREAS plaintiff alleges antitrust violations by manufacturers of Liquid Crysta		
23	Display ("LCD") products;		
24	WHEREAS more than fifteen complaints have been filed to date in federal district		
25	courts throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bring class actions on beha		
26	of indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers of LCD products		
27			
	(collectively, "the LCD Cases");		
28			

Case 3:06-cv-07888-SI Document 8 Filed 01/19/07 Page 2 of 3

1	WHEREAS there are motions pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict	
2	Litigation to transfer the LCD Cases to the Northern District of California or the District of	
3	New Jersey for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §	
4	1407;	
5	WHEREAS plaintiff anticipates the possibility of Consolidated Amended	
6	Complaints in the LCD Cases;	
7	WHEREAS plaintiff and defendant Sharp Electronics Corporation ("SEC") have	
8	agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the LCD Cases would	
9	be more efficient for the parties and for the Court;	
10	WHEREAS plaintiff agrees that the deadline for SEC to respond to the Complaint	
11	shall be extended until the earlier of the following two dates: (1) forty-five days after the	
12	filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after	
13	plaintiff provides written notice to SEC that he does not intend to file a Consolidated	
14	Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case	
15	management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case;	
16	WHEREAS plaintiff further agrees that this extension is available, without further	
17	stipulation with counsel for plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writin	
18	of their intention to join this extension;	
19	WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by SEC or any defendant	
20	of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject	
21	matter jurisdiction, insufficiency of process, insufficiency of service of process, or improper	
22	venue.	
23	PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, BY	
24	AND THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY	
25	STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:	
26	1. The deadline for the SEC to respond to the Complaint shall be extended until	
27	the earlier of the following two dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated	
28	Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after the plaintiff provides	

Case 3:06-cv-07888-SI Document 8 Filed 01/19/07 Page 3 of 3

1	written notice that he does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provide	
2	that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the	
3	MDL transferee court in this case.	
4	2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for	
5	plaintiff or further order of the Court, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in	
6	writing of their intention to join this extension.	
7	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
8		
9	Dated: January 18, 2007	Dated: January 18, 2007
10	Signature: /s/ Peter E. Borkon	Signature: /s/ Albert J. Boro, Jr.
11	Robert C. Schubert	Albert J. Boro, Jr. Joanne H. Kim Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP 50 Fremont Street San Francisco, California 94105 Counsel for Defendant Sharp Electronics Corporation
12	Schubert & Reed LLP Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1650 San Francisco, CA 94111 Counsel for Plaintiff Dr. Steven Martel	
13		
14		
15		
16	SO ORDERED:	DICT
17	SO ORDERED.	STATES DISTRICT CO.
18	Dated: January 19, 2007	Stripited appered to the striping of the strip
19		Third SO ORDERED ISE
20		Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte DISTRICT OF CHARLES
21		Juage Line
22		DISTRICTOR
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		